



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/800,584	03/15/2004	Jose Madeira De Freitas Garcia	G&C 30566.320-US-01	1678

55895 7590 09/07/2007  
GATES & COOPER LLP  
HOWARD HUGHES CENTER  
6701 CENTER DRIVE WEST, SUITE 1050  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90045

EXAMINER
----------

TAKELE, MESEKER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

09/07/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 10/800,584	Applicant(s) GARCIA ET AL.	
	Examiner Meseker Takele	Art Unit 2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 June 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 March 2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some    \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                        | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This communication is responsive to the Amendment filed June 19, 2007.
2. Claims 1-15 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 6 and 11 are independent claims. Claims 1, 6 and 11 were amended. This action is made Final.
3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

### **Applicant's Response**

1. Based on Applicant's amendments and remarks, the following objections and rejections previously set forth in Office Action dated 03/19/2007 are withdrawn:
  - a) Objection to Specification
  - b) 35 U.S.C. 101 Rejection to claim 11.

### **Drawings**

1. Figures 1 and 2 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the examiner does not accept the changes, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bonney et al. (US Patent No: 6,466,953) in view of Powell et al. (US 2004/0078394) and in further in view of Barnes et al. (US Patent No.: 6,633,674).

As to claims 1, 6 and 11, Bonney discloses, a method for operating a graphics program in a computer (example, method for graphical display, computer aided design (CAD) application, such as Sheet Set Manager, see col., 3 lines 1-2, col., 2 line, 66, col., 2 lines, 66-67 and abstract) comprising:

performing one or more functions of a Sheet Set Manager in the graphics program (example, computer system 100 to manage and organize objects of drawing sheets of a CAD, see col., 3 lines, 46-48, col., 1 lines, 26-30 and abstract),

(a) wherein the Sheet Set Manager manages one or more Sheet Sets, each of the Sheet Sets comprises a collection of zero or more Sheets and Subsets of the Sheets each of the Sheets comprises a drawing, layout or view (example, Drawings, in general, may include many details of the models such as, but not limited, alternate views, section views, detail views of certain aspects of each of the models" (see col. 1 lines 26-30 and Examiner considers the drawings to be a set of drawing sheets and the section views to be subsets of the sheets).

However Bonney does not disclose, automatically packaging, communicating and storing of the Sheet Set, Subsets and Sheets, and associated files, as a cohesive unit, such that the transmittal and archive function acts upon the Sheet Set, Subsets and Sheets, and associated files as a whole using one-step functionality.

Powell from the same field of endeavor discloses automatically packaging, communicating and storing of the Sheet Set, Subsets and Sheets, and associated files, as a cohesive unit, such that the transmittal and archive function acts upon the Sheet Set, Subsets and Sheets, and associated files as a whole using one-step functionality (example, Examiner considers electronic envelope (120), zip, such as automatically packaging, an electronic storage, such as storing, submitting documents electronically, such as communicating, see paragraph [0024].

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Bonney's CAD application with electronic envelope as presented by Powell.

However Bonney and Powell do not expressly disclose transmittal and archive. Barnes from the same field of endeavor discloses transmittal and archive (example, such as picture archiving and communication, see col., 2 lines, 39-40).

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine Barne's teaching with the method of Bonney and Powell in order to allow requesting clients to rapidly and accurately access image data files stored within the system

4. Claims 6 and 11 are similar in scope to claim 1 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As to claims 2, 7 and 12, Powell discloses, wherein the transmittal and archive function collects all files related to the Sheet Set Subsets, and Sheets (see paragraph [0054]).

5. Claims 7 and 12 are similar in scope to claim 2 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As to claims 3, 8 and 13, Bonney does not disclose, wherein the transmittal and archive function automatically extracts and bundles, all referenced files related to the Sheet Set, Subsets, and Sheets.

Powell from the same field of endeavor discloses, extracts and bundle all referenced files related to the Sheet Set (example, zip, packaging (envelop 120), retrieved, automation, various types of files, paragraph [0024], [0050], [0004] and [0054]).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified the modified Bonney's CAD application with bundling files as presented by Powell.

The motivation to combine will allow minimization of the space required for storage or transmission. Because "zipping" for example is well - known in the art to bundle and compress a group of files into a package file.

6. Claims 8 and 13 are similar in scope to claim 3 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

7. Claims 4, 5, 9, 10 and 14, 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bonney et al. (US Patent No: 6,466,953) in view of Powell et al. (US 2004/0078394) and Barnes et al. (US Patent No.: 6,633,674) as applied to claims 1, 6 and 11 and in further view of Brown et al. (US 2004/0088657).

As to claims 4, 9 and 14, the modified Bonney discloses all the claim limitations of claims 1, 6 and 11 but does not expressly disclose support files necessary to view and edit the Sheets. Brown from the same field of endeavor discloses all support files necessary to view and edit the Sheets (example, CAD file, font, see paragraph [0022] and Figure (element 27).

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine Brown's teaching with the method of Bonney and Powell in order to have allowed a user to have been able to read labels or comments of the cad program in different languages, thereby overcoming a language barrier between two users accessing a CAD document.

8. Claims 9 and 14 are similar in scope to claim 4 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As to claims 5, 10 and 15, Powell discloses, wherein the transmittal and archive function compresses the Sheet Set, Subsets, and Sheets and prepares them to be saved, emailed, or otherwise transmitted (example, Zip, When a document is stored and then retrieved the document is restored to its original binary sequence (that means it was compressed), see paragraph, [0024]). Because "zipping" for example is well - known in the art to bundle and compress a group of files into a package file.

9. Claims 10 and 15 are similar in scope to claim 5 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

### **Response to Arguments**

10. Applicant's arguments with respect to the amended claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

**Conclusion**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Meseker Takele whose telephone number is (571) 270-1653. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:30AM- 5:00PM est.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MT

*Kristine Kincaid*  
KRISTINE KINCAID  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100